UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

An Open Letter to Senator Borah - - -
Brent Dow Allinson

Now Is the Time - - - *William Floyd*

This False Dilemma - *George M. Gibson*

The Coming Peace - - - *Joseph Barth*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 2, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN, FRED HANKINSON, REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL, ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 69

ARTICLES—
Why Build a Second Navy?—An Open Letter to Senator Borah—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 70
Now Is the Time—WILLIAM FLOYD 73
This False Dilemma—GEORGE M. GIBSON 74
The Coming Peace—JOSEPH BARTH 75

THE STUDY TABLE—
America and the Next War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 77
No Peace with Napoleon—ROBERT SCHALLER 78
Dr. Morgan's Book—V. FREIDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK 78

CORRESPONDENCE—
Dr. Morgan and the T. V. A.—
I—JUDSON KING 80
II—MAY STRANATHAN 80
III—LYMAN WARD 80
A Freedom of the Press Case—MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE 80

THE FIELD—
Suggesting a Model Parade for Our Army Day—ERNEST L. MEYER, New York *Post* 66
Ten Commandments of Brotherhood—DR. WALTER W. VAN KIRK 79
Industry Wants Peace 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Suggesting a Model Parade for Our Army Day

By ERNEST L. MEYER

Today marks the official celebration of Army Day. In New York soldiers are parading, and in Washington there is being staged a huge review of infantry, artillery, tanks, and all the other paraphernalia artfully designed to blast humans into Hades.

I'd like to see the doings, but on second thought I think I'll stay home and play parchesi with the elevator man. Because, much as I hate to admit it, the sight of soldiers and salutes, the drone of bombing planes, the kittenish tanks tearing across the terrain, make me want to rise up and howl for war if only to see these delightful toys in actual operation. If one owns a baseball or a hand grenade, it is foolish not to throw the dang thing.

And that, I think, is the reaction of the average person witnessing huge and impressive military demonstrations and sham battles. Therefore all such demonstrations are dangerous. In all justice, the Washington review should include not only war's brawn but its backwash.

In the review there should have been included the 50,000 World War veterans in the Walter Reed and other government hospitals who are crippled, bedridden, or slowly dying of the effect of gas or of tuberculosis caught in the trenches.

To be sure, this would not be a pretty sight, for the veterans would have to hobble on crutches or be hauled in wheel chairs or stretchers. And yet such a parade would have a wholesome effect on suggestible citizens who are minded to whoop it up for war when they see only its tinsel and not its terror.

If I had my way, I'd go a step further and on the anniversary of America's entrance into the World War I would cause to be staged each year a tremendous parade with the following order of march:

General marshal: A towering figure representing the Pied Piper. He is dressed in a flowing cloak composed of the flags of many nations, and he plays on his pipe seductive music luring on his doomed rattalions.

Advance section: Poisoned propaganda department dressed in official uniform of weasel weskits perfumed by attar of polecat. Also profiteering munitions men, bankers, publicists, and four-minute mumblers cleverly camouflaged as patriots, and surrounded by a smoke screen of buncombe and befuddlement.

First section: A float of scraps of paper and shredded pacts and treaties soaked in blood around which flutters a cloud of diplomatic buzzards and vultures.

(*Continued on page* 79)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, MAY 2, 1938 No. 5

THE DANGEROUS MILITARY MIND

The military mind when it is highly developed is dangerous. It sees only its own bit, but this it sees with great clearness, and in consequence becomes very powerful.

—Lord Haldane.

INCREDIBLE!

There is an incredibleness about modern warfare that defies all description or even realization. The bombardments of Madrid and Barcelona, for example, day after day these many months—unfortified cities, filled not with soldiers but with non-combatants, children, old men and women, mothers! The fighting in China is another instance—the worst horrors of war deliberately forced on congested, helpless, and innocent masses of people! It is easy, perhaps inevitable, to say that the world has never seen anything like it. This, of course, is not true—as read the stories of Attila, and Ghenghis Khan, and even Alexander the Great! But it *is* true that nothing of this kind has ever been seen before among civilized peoples as the natural and normal course of warfare. If there is any parallel, it would be the Thirty Years War, which stands in history as a classic example of unbridled savagery. It is interesting to note that it was religion which was behind this barbaric struggle of three centuries ago. A kind of religion is behind these hideous conflicts of this later day. Communism and Fascism now confront one another in Europe with all the fanaticism of Catholicism and Protestantism after the Reformation. As for Japan in Asia, there is a nationalistic patriotism at work there, centering in the worship of the Mikado, which brings to mind the fierce passion of the Saracens when they swept into battle to die for Allah and his prophet, Mohammed. For a time at least our modern civilization has broken down. We are being swept back into ways of ancient terror, and reliving the experiences of times long since thought dead forever. The encouraging thing is that man survived even the worst experiences of the past, and that out of darkness came light again. We also shall survive, and civilization return like "the dayspring from on high." Yet does it still remain *incredible* that such savagery should once more engulf the world.

THE PEOPLE WANT PEACE!

The English by-election three weeks ago, which returned a Laborite in a conservative district, may or may not presage an electoral overturn in Britain. That it is a set-back for the Prime Minister is obvious, but not serious. What is supremely significant in this election is that everybody was voting for peace. Supporters of Chamberlain urged electors to sustain the government as the one way of staying out of war. Supporters of the opposition urged electors to sustain the Labor candidate and the platform of coöperative action against Fascist aggression as the one way of staying out of war. A little less than half of the voters thought Chamberlain's policy the safer and surer; a little more than half favored the opposite policy. But all favored peace! There wasn't a war candidate or a war ballot in the campaign. Another sign of the essential pacifism of the English people is seen in the almost complete collapse of the government's appeal for volunteer enlistments in the air defense service of the kingdom. Accompanied by a terrific patriotic hullabaloo, the books were opened for the names of those who were eager to do their part to fight off the invader—and only a few thousands responded. At last reports less than 7 per cent of the recruits asked for had been secured. Still another sign is the haste and definiteness of the Prime Minister's repudiation of the rumor that he was thinking of applying peacetime conscription. He couldn't move fast enough in denying what stirred instant revolt in the English heart. And meanwhile the War Resisters campaign moves on from triumph to triumph —thousands of English citizens every week signing the pledge never to support another war! No wonder the government is taking no chances! Nor is England any exception these days. We believe that the people everywhere are for peace—yes, at any price. The British Dominions have long since informed London that they will not fight in a European war. The American people are utterly unresponsive to any war appeal. The French support no belligerent move anywhere. In

Spain the people would make peace tomorrow if they were free to do so. So would the Fascist peoples if they dared to speak or move. It is governments that make war. They would be making war today, if they didn't fear revolutions at home.

JAPAN IS RIDING FOR A FALL

Now that excitement is dying down in Europe, it is possible to look at Asia again. Strange things seem to be going on there. Conspicuous is the fact that Japan isn't getting anywhere in China. On the one hand, her armies seem to be blocked. There is plenty of fighting, occasional defeats, but no victory. This surely must be a surprise to Tokyo, for if anything is well known it is that the Japanese military authorities counted confidently on repeating south of the Great Wall what had so easily been achieved north of the Great Wall in Manchuria. On the other hand, China is united, and thus not only not fighting in civil wars against herself, but actually fighting against the invader on a single front. Hitherto we have thought of contemporary China only as a field of operations for bandit chieftains and feudal war-lords. But now all this useless internecine fighting seems to have come to an end. How long is it since we have heard of a war-lord selling out to the enemy or turning against his own countrymen in arms? What is perfectly apparent today is that Chiang Kai-shek now leads a united people in a war for national independence. All this means momentous things for the future. In the first place, of course, a not distant ending of the war! What this will precipitate in Tokyo we do not know, but it cannot be any good for the Japanese war machine. In China it will mean release not only from this war, but henceforth from bondage to foreign powers. The end of the fighting must be followed, sooner or later, by an international conference at which China will serve notice not only on Japan but also on other powers to withdraw their troops and ships, and cancel their concessions. At one stroke the menace of Japan will be shifted, and China will enter upon her appropriate destiny for the future. What this will mean for Europe will be momentous, for Britain, relieved of the Sino-Japanese crisis, will be able forthwith to bring her whole power to bear upon Germany and Italy. We know of nothing that so fully explains Chamberlain's present policy as this—that he is holding off Europe at any price (even with Mussolini), pending the settlement of Asiatic difficulties, which is certain to come soon. If Hitler proposes to do anything further, he had better move quickly!

WHAT ABOUT FRANCE?

We note a growing tendency to compare France with the United States — Blum with Roosevelt — the collapse of the French New Deal with that of the American New Deal. The comparison seems to us to be superficial, even wrong-headed. In the first place, there isn't any collapse of the New Deal in this country! There is obviously an uprising against the President, a lessening of his personal popularity, a determination to keep him well within the bounds of our constitutional system of balanced powers as between executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the government; but the New Deal stands and promises to stand. For better or worse, the people still support the policies which make up the program of the administration, as we expect this fall's elections to show clearly. But France is in the clutch of reaction. It is not only Blum who is out but his policies which are repudiated. Furthermore, whereas the American people have turned decisively against the rule of the strong man in office, the French people have turned as decisively in favor of the strong man. The new Premier, Daladier, has much of the dictator in him, he has ousted from cabinet positions all radical and even liberal influences, and he is being granted power to rule by arbitrary decree and by authority not of the law but of the army. In all this we see comparison not with America at all but with Germany—the Germany of Bruenning in 1931-32. In Berlin, as now in France, there was a paralysis of the national legislature through multiplicity of contending parties and factions, there was a currency collapse of critical significance, there was a suspension of the constitution and the substitution therefor of extraordinary executive power, all of which prepared the way for Hitler. That France is on the road to Fascism still seems doubtful—there is no Hitler in sight, no Nazi party, and the people are still the most bourgeois in the world. Nonetheless, the situation is fraught with peril, and the trend toward Fascism, or its likeness, obvious.

THE PRESIDENT AND PUMP-PRIMING AGAIN

With much of President Roosevelt's demand for huge government expenditures in this new economic crisis, we are in sympathy. We must have money, for example, for relief. The total of unemployment is now greater than at any time since the first depression, and there is no sign of business being able to provide jobs. These unhappy millions cannot be left to starve—they must be taken care of, and Washington is the only agency that can do the job. Along with out-and-out relief, also, there may well go money for W.P.A. projects and C.C.C. camps. The President is right—these needs must be met, and his program presents ways and means which are as economical under the circumstances as can be provided. Our dissent begins with the idea of "pump-priming"—the notion that all this vast expenditure of funds is going to accomplish

the return to prosperity. That this is the way to fight the depression seems to us as sensible, and no more, as the notion that the way to get peace is to fight another war to end war. We tried that method once—we fought about the finest war to end war the world has ever seen. And the net result was not peace at all, but more war under conditions which threaten a complete international catastrophe. In the same way, we have tried this method of getting rid of a depression by spending billions of dollars and thus increasing purchasing power. This method worked just as long as the money was poured out to be spent, but it never made a dent upon the actual situation. Immediately after the transfusion ceased, the depression returned worse than ever—only this time more swiftly, with deeper depths of prostration well in sight. As an emergency measure for great disaster, the President's call for funds is unanswerable. As a remedy for our ills, it is worse than useless. The job of restoring, or rather rebuilding, the economic structure of the nation's life still remains to be done.

CROP CONTROL

Brazil has given it up as a bad job! She has been trying crop control for years, has resorted to every known device, and now has decided to let Nature take its course. The experiment in Brazil had a particularly good chance to succeed, if any such experiment can ever succeed, since this South American country tackled only a single crop, coffee, and not everything from cotton to peanuts as we have done in this country. Brazil produces two-thirds of the world's supply of coffee. A long time ago she discovered that the price was "too low," and at once jumped to the conclusion that this was because the crop was too large. So—her wiseheads, like ours, decided the crop must be cut down. First of all, she restricted the area of planting; then she bought up surplus production and burned it, or cast it into the sea; then she got the "normal granary" idea, and began storing coffee. But it all availed nothing, as any Simple Simon might have known. The cost, which was enormous, had to be retrieved in taxes, and these taxes nearly ruined the very planters the government was trying so hard to help. The more coffee was destroyed in Brazil, the more was planted, raised, and marketed in other South American countries, with the consequent loss of the foreign markets upon which the Brazilians depended for survival. The more the acreage was cut down, the more intensive was the cultivation, with the result of increased crops per acre. And always there remained the vagaries of weather! Brazil has at last learned the lesson, which the United States is now painfully learning. And what is this lesson? That the problem of surplus production is to be handled not at the production end at all, but at the distribution end. A large crop? Distribute it in a market constantly enlarged by the low price guaranteed by abundance! To maintain high prices by destroying crops is to diminish markets, and in the end to destroy them altogether. Strange that it took decades for Brazil to learn that to sell 1,000,000 pounds of coffee at 6 cents is at least as profitable as to sell 500,000 pounds at 10 cents! And stranger still that we can't learn the same lesson of wheat, and cotton, and beef, and pork, and potatoes! Here for nearly five years we have been fooling with crop controls, and here we are with high prices, business recession, and an unbalanced budget threatening new ruin. Scarcity economy is a curse—and abundance economy alone a blessing.

Jottings

We have always thought that Ivory Soap's "99 $^{44}/_{100}$ per cent pure" was the nearest thing to perfection in this imperfect world. But Hitler's plebiscites are a fraction better. Election betting in Germany must be a lost art.

Dorothy Thompson reminds us that Germany has won the war! If there is any such thing as brains inside men's skulls, this fact ought to set the world thinking about this last war in a way to make impossible the next war.

The indemnity bill for the sinking of the *Panay*, presented by Washington to Tokyo, calls for a payment of $2,214,007.36. Tokyo has asked for an itemized statement. It will be interesting to find out what the 36 cents is for—also the 7 dollars!

Is there anything that General Franco would not do if he knew that the doing of it would immediately end the war in Spain with victory? Is there anything that the Loyalists would not do if they had a guaranty that the doing of it would destroy the Rebels and clear Spain of all its enemies? The answers to these two questions, the same in each case, spell the whole horror of war.

The complications of this world are getting to the point where life is all but unbearable. Thus, New York City has just clapped a lot of new taxes on consumers' goods, and has made the devastating discovery

that revenue stamps won't stick on cellophane wrappers. If that isn't the last straw. . . . !

We can think of no greater loss to the Christian church in America than the death of Dr. Frederick B. Fisher, of Detroit, at fifty-six years of age. Methodist bishop of Bombay, friend of Gandhi, able organizer, great preacher, champion of social progress and enlightenment, he was a true disciple of the immortal Wesley.

J. H. H.

Why Build a Second Navy?

An Open Letter to Senator Borah

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

My Dear Senator:

Has it occurred to you, as it has to more than one competent journalist in Washington recently, that the current spy-scare and war-scare loudly bruited in the press is not accidental, and not without an ulterior and very material purpose? And that it has been neatly timed and widely publicized to coincide with the drive for an unheard of expansion of American naval armament, and for a nullification and complete reversal of the carefully considered, slowly matured, and prudent national policy of "automatic" arms-embargoes, honest neutrality, and economic non-intervention in foreign wars, declared or undeclared, which has been thrice formulated, enacted, amended and reaffirmed by Congress since the "Ethiopian" summer of 1935, and thrice approved by the same President who now champions its overthrow?

Have you observed that the current big navy agitation is confined for the most part to the industrial cities and metropolitan newspapers of the East; and that California, where the much anticipated Japanese attack would presumably fall in its first suicidal fury, remains as yet unaroused? If so, if your long experience with foreign affairs and political propaganda makes you question the disinterestedness and even the patriotism of this phenomenon, have you closely inquired whose and what industrial and economic interests are moving behind this very disturbing agitation?

If you were not among the gilded guests at the latest wine-party given recently at his luxurious apartment in Washington by the mysterious "Bill" Shearer —sometime bootlegger, blackleg and political confidence-man for the New York Shipbuilding and Bethlehem Steel Corporations, confessedly sent to Geneva to wreck the Four-Power Naval Limitation Conference of 1927—(and we surmise that you were not invited, and would not have gone if you had been), may we suggest that it is high time that you and other honest and patriotic members of the United States Senate should inquire as to who and what are behind the big navy agitation? And that before you authorize another gigantic raid on the public treasury of this embarrassed Republic, or approve the expenditure of at least a billion additional dollars—beyond the annual half-billion for the upkeep of the naval establishment—and perhaps three billion, for the construction of a second navy of superfluous and ornamental super-dreadnaughts that may be rendered obsolete before they can be launched (and may clog and overflow the Panama Canal if they are launched), you and your more intelligent colleagues should insist upon expending a half million, if necessary, on a carefully planned and fearless public investigation of this new naval policy and agitation—of the origins and ramifications of bigger navy propaganda in the United States, and elsewhere, in the light of the extraordinary leads and revelations of the Senate's important Munitions Investigation of 1936, and of the moot question of the direction and control of our foreign policy (which the Constitution plainly entrusts to the Senate as well as to the Executive),—in short, of what constitutes "adequate national defense" for the American people and our territorial possessions —excluding the Philippines, Shanghai, the Yangtze River Valley, Inner Mongolia, Afghanistan, the Suez Canal, Gibraltar, Spain, and the Falkland Islands?

So far as we know, there has never been anything like agreement among our naval and military experts as to whether the Philippines are defensible, nor as to what constitutes adequate national defense; and there can be none until the limits of national policy as well as territory are defined. In the absence of authoritative and intelligent definition and limitation by Congress, American militarism and navalism—loving an intellectual vacuum—will define it for themselves, and for us, in the grand tradition of Admiral Mahan's disquisitions upon Sea Power in History (howsoever fallacious and costly) and in the steady direction of indefinite expansion. They will do this under the slogan of National Defense—if not Manifest Destiny—as in official testimony of the admirals before the Congressional naval committee-hearings on the Vinson super-navy Bill—with tongue in cheek and numerous contradictions of statement, which they suppose nobody will observe. (For example: "We have no intention of fighting an aggressive war; we arm solely for defense of our territories, [including, however, by implication the Philippines], and of our trade-routes. But we must have a navy at least 60 per cent stronger than that of Japan for this 'defense' of our great triangle in the Pacific Ocean and the South Seas, lest some long-range blockade conducted somewhere in the Celebes, beyond the time-meridian and below the equator, should cripple our national security.") Fifteen years ago, these same admirals admitted that a 5-5-3 naval ratio would enable the United States Navy to conduct hostile operations, if necessary, in the home waters of Japan; we now insist upon maintaining that ratio, even if we have to build another navy, with the largest floating batteries that man has ever built, including 45,000-ton battleships and $75,000,000 airplane carriers. Although the Japanese Premier has publicly offered to abolish and abandon the construction of battleships entirely, we insist upon the construction of two new super-battleships immediately, even if this bankrupts the Federal Treasury, and postpones indefinitely the possibility of balancing the budget. Why?

We have, then, a vicious circle of unbalanced and dangerous illusions closing in upon us, as they have

closed in upon the older nations of Europe, dooming them to periodic self-extermination.

> For East and West will crush the heart
> Who cannot keep them pushed apart;
> And he whose soul is flat—the sky
> Will cave in on him by and by! . . .

It is caving in, even now, upon America, as we permit ourselves to be drawn and "buncoed" into the colossal naval game, thinking that only force can speak the emancipating word in international politics when, as a matter of fact, honest concessions and earnest coöperative search for international economic justice have not been made; and thereby sacrificing ultimate good and immediate, imperative reforms at home and abroad for the fatal folly of joining in the international armaments race. To invite big navalism to dictate American foreign policy, with the certain consequence of growing budgetary deficit and international insecurity, is to throw Reason overboard, install Panic in the captain's cabin, and open the door wide to sensational journalism, war-scare, bankruptcy, recession, depression, and unemployment in the normal and constructive trades, through which national wealth and well-being are really produced, and to the whole train of emotions and illusions concerning the national defense of democracy and our own interests, which prolonged stupidity, cupidity, and short-sighted diplomacy indulge and approve!

We clearly recall a very eloquent and timely address which you made to the Senate, in the winter of 1935,—when the first Vinson Bill, (proposing a million-ton, billion-dollar navy), appeared over the horizon, on the subject of the armament dealers, "who violate all the laws of God and man"—and particularly your pointed remark that every time a great naval appropriation bill comes to the bar of the Senate you have observed, for years, that the public is treated to a war-scare and spy-scare, with Japan usually filling the role of the "big bad wolf," waiting to pounce upon California, Mexico, or the Panama Canal. That speech of yours, and an article from *Fortune Magazine* on which it was largely based, gave wide currency in this country to unanswerable facts and damning indictments first published by members of the English Union for Democratic Control, concerning "The Secret International" and the world armament "ring",—a kind of international cartel composed of the industrial houses of Vickers, Nobel, Armstrong, the Zaharoffs, the du Ponts, the Electric Boat Company, of New London, Conn., and their great coadjutors in the navies, armies, armament-manufacturing and arms-selling circles of eight or nine countries. Your address made a vivid impression on the Senate and the country. It contributed directly to the authorization of the important Munitions Investigation of 1935-1937—the world's first official effort to uncover and control a sardonic and widely ramified commercial conspiracy of salesmen, industrialists, governments, and newspapers, which periodically devours its peace. That investigation, conducted by seven Senators under the chairmanship of Senator Nye, prompted a less effective British and Chilean one; and it resulted in a sustained effort of a courageous and intelligent minority of both houses of Congress to legislate against a repetition of the calamities of 1916-1918, and to insure the American people against the kind of unwitting and unwelcome involvement in foreign intrigues and war which then victimized them.

That effort, earnest and well-matured, with a century and a half of American history and experience behind it, culminated in the new Neutrality Acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937, devised to reduce at least the shameless private profiteering from public war-preparations; to prohibit the aiding and abetting of warfare by the profitable private sale of the instrumentalities of slaughter to governments engaged in war, whether declared or undeclared; and to modify and modernize the reckless, laissez-faire commercialism of our traditional commercial policy affecting the international traffic in ammunition, arms, and other implements of war, in time of war. Imperfect as was this legislation, particularly in its so-called cash-and-carry provisions, the law, with successive modifications and improvements, was thrice approved by the same President who has failed, or refused, to enforce its terms or vindicate its valid principles of honest non-intervention, and economic non-assistance, in the case of the Japanese-Chinese war. In consequence of this failure, we have now drifted towards disaster! For we have permitted our industrialists, bankers, and exporters to equip, supply, and munition both Japan and China with the means and implements of carnage and devastation, without official let or hindrance, as gold and profit beckoned to them to do it. And, inasmuch as the Japanese credit, commercially if not morally speaking, was far stronger than that of the Chinese Government, our aid—if one takes petroleum, scrap-iron, chemicals, cotton, and other munitions and secondary contraband of war into consideration—has gone in vastly larger quantity to Japan during the prosecution of its merciless war, than it has to China, the victim of that war. Thus, contrary to the eloquent statement of President Roosevelt's memorable Chautauqua address of 1936, the American people under his leadership in this crisis have chosen profits rather than peace, and the embargoes of the Neutrality Act have not been applied, as they were intended to be applied, to exactly this kind of international crime. Added to the pressure of commercial and exporting interests for the continuation of "business as usual" in wartime, has been the propaganda of the indefatigable advocates of what is ever less convincingly called "collective security," steadily directed against the principles of the Neutrality Act and towards coercive and warlike action of the traditional balance-of-power school of diplomacy. In a world of rival, if not equal, nations armed to the teeth and dominated by dictators, such a theory and such propaganda have materially contributed to the nullification of the New Neutrality, which might have become the most potent implementation of international law and of a *Pax Economica!*

Numberless millions of the taxpayers' hard-earned money are about to be squandered by Congress on a super-naval "field-day," and a Roman carnival of enlarged military and aerial establishments, in the sacred name of national defense—without limiting or defining it—and for national policies that remain darkly obscure. . . . What, we inquire, is a "hemispherical navy," of which Congressman Vinson talks so bravely, and darkly, and what is it for? . . . Is it for protecting the Amazonians from dubious designs of the Brazilian Feuhrer, or the Patagonians from Italian or Paraguayan Fascism? . . Do you remember, Mr. Borah, how, long before Congress or the country had ever accepted the novel idea of maintaining a navy equal in size and strength to the British, it was hopefully proposed to dig the great Panama Canal—"in order to double the striking-power of the Atlantic fleet," and thus avoid the expensive necessity of enlarging it to cope with "the Yellow

Peril"—there being no other? Indeed, we were all told then by the most ardent national defenders, including the D. A. R., that thereby we would save money that would otherwise be squandered on cruisers. But, do you also recall that, after completing the Canal, it was soon discovered that we needed a larger navy than ever, in order to defend it? And that the Navy then made several armed descents upon Hispaniola and other perturbed Caribbean republics—for the same reason? Some years afterward, the big navy boys slyly inserted into their annual appropriation bill the occult principle of "parity" with Great Britain, of a navy "second to none," and got it approved (in principle), protesting that, while nobody dreamed of really building a million tons of floating steel fortresses, or of actually maintaining an establishment the size of that of the ancient Mistress of the Seas, it was necessary to assert the abstract principle of parity as a matter of national honor as well as defense—and to get it approved by Congress, and by the British Government. This was done, under some duress, before and at the Washington Conference of 1921, when Japan was assigned to an inferior position, and the long-standing British-Japanese alliance was terminated—an alliance, by the way, which British conservatives of the "Cliveden cabal" are now hinting should be revived, either to check American navalism, or to wean Japan from her German mésalliance, or for other reasons (but obviously *not* for the purpose of saving massacred China).

Now, the same ambitious crew of big navy buccaneers is talking grimly about a "hemispherical navy" for the United States, without any political consultations with the other members of the Hemisphere. What does this mean? Presumably, it means an American navy large enough to defend the Atlantic and Pacific coasts simultaneously "against any possible combination of powers in either ocean," from Newfoundland to Cape Horn, and the Aleutians to Valparaiso. And that fantastic idea—worthy of the imagination of Messrs. Gilbert and Sullivan and the admirals of the Queen's Navee—is about to be incorporated in obscurantist language in the august Vinson billion-dollar Super-naval Bill, now pending. (Only the abstract principle, mind you; that is all they need now.) But the sums already estimated as necessary to realize even a portion of this hemispherical hallucination reach astronomical figures—without including anything for the additional dry docks and naval bases, for the enlargement of private shipbuilding facilities (and profiteering!) which this program will necessitate—and without calculating the political consequences and naval repercussions which any such provocative program will certainly produce in Japan, Britain, and elsewhere. . . How large a navy shall we be stampeded into authorizing, we ask you, if the one that we are now debating should result in a renewal of the Anglo-American alliance—and if in order to achieve psychological security on both coasts simultaneously, we are persuaded to believe that we must maintain a navy second to none in both oceans? What if Germany, or Italy, should then be lured or jockeyed into joining that "combination against us"—which every naval strategist and propagandist fears—for the sake of furthering some pan-European scheme of bringing Kultur and Kapitalismus to South America, or saving Brazil from "the communistic Americans," by partitioning it (like the Guianas), while Great Britain, discreetly preserving a "strict neutrality" under a Tory dictatorship, immobilizes the American Atlantic fleet?

This nightmare is not beyond the bounds of political possibility, nor of the mephistophelian logic of nationalistic power-politics. It is certainly to be invited by indulging in the kind of naval orgy now seriously proposed. The time to stop it is before it is successfully launched "in principle"; for once started and in motion, every venal economic and political interest that feeds upon great naval building contracts and services conspires to drive it forward, even Labor; and the counsels of intelligence are thrown overboard, like ballast, lest the ships with Reason on board should sink.

May we, therefore, earnestly suggest that an even more timely and important senatorial investigation is needed now into the subjects of the propagation of American big navalism; of the mystery as to who conceives and formulates our foreign policy and what it is; of the nature and limitation of "adequate national defense"; of profiteering in the war shipbuilding and merchant-shipbuilding industries, in particular; of naval propaganda and the political implications of the dangerous policy which the President is now apparently determined to impose upon the sober sense of the country, without explaining why he has not enforced the principles of the Neutrality Acts in the greatest conflict since the World War. The old Senate Munitions Committee is still technically in existence, although its activities and funds have lapsed. It might easily be galvanized into renewed activity, by a simple resolution of the Senate, which you might propose; and in view of Senator Copeland's avid desire to disclose the workings of alien espionage among the labor unions of our merchant shipping, do you not think that a little study of the collusive operations of the companies that construct them, of the propagandas of the Shearer's and the Bingham's and the John Q. Tilson's, of the Connecticut arms-factories, would be a salubrious antidote to public nervousness? . . . The forces that are driving us like Gadarenian swine rushing down the last slopes of Hell to the Bottomless Pit are not strange and foreign and faraway—in Moscow, Berlin, Rome, or Tokyo. They are as familiar as Hearst, and as egregiously American as Schwab. Let us expose them, now, before it is too late! For they are engaged in promoting the most colossal international racket and most costly and deceptive confidence-game in Christendom; and the selfish armament-makers and brokers behind them are sapping the foundations of civilization and undermining our patriotism, our security, and our true national defense as they inflame the unreasoning fears of the people and pile up armaments against their colleagues and fellow profiteers, who are doing the same thing beyond the oceans, east and west. . . . Will you not arise again, Mr. Borah, in your honored place as a servant of the American people and of the truth as you see it—will you not arise and speak the ringing words that might help to set us free, and save us from our unworthy selves—our ignorance, our cupidity, and our fear—and particularly from the senseless extravagance of this international conspiracy and the hysterical hallucinations of this bankrupting and criminal naval nonsense?*

If an agreement must be reached eventually with the ambitious states and underprivileged peoples, some of whom we have grievously wounded in body and mind, why not now before their doom, and ours, is sealed? Let us have a full-length congressional investigation of the new navalism now!

*Senator Borah has spoken vigorously this week in direction advocated by author.

Now Is the Time

WILLIAM FLOYD

Now is the time for all bad men to declare that this is not the time to reform the world. Now is the time, according to many good men, either to keep America out of war, or to use our forces to prevent further Fascist aggression.

It must be admitted that the present appears to be an inauspicious moment for the attempt to abolish war and establish peace; but time marches on with ever-increasing militarism; each day is preferable to its successor. Today is a better time to work for peace than after the next war has started. Better risk a gas chamber now than live in a gas mask forever. The future is not worth while if it means perpetual war.

The best time that has occurred in our generation for the establishment of peace was immediately after the World War when the "one guilty nation" had been subdued and the other guilty nations were bankrupt and war-weary. Instead of making peace, however, the victors divided the spoils, refused to disarm and perpetrated the war-breeding Treaty of Versailles. The great moment was lost.

Time does not forgive the failure to grasp the opportunity when it comes. The greedy Allies overstepped themselves. Germany has risen from its ashes to produce the dictator Hitler who is a greater menace than the Kaiser. German militarism has conquered the world. Democracy is waning; Fascism is rampant. The British and French who failed to take advantage of the time when they were all-powerful, now make concessions to Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The course proposed by pacifists twenty years ago, when the time was also said to be inappropriate, would have brought peace, whereas the policy of postponing reforms has brought about the present sorry mess. Reliance upon force has failed. The democratic nations of the last generation are now in danger from the upstart Fascists because they were unwilling to recognize justice.

Permanent peace cannot be secured until law is substituted for war as the customary procedure for settling international difficulties. If that be true, all other proposals for peace are merely halfway measures, and unless they lead to the adoption of law they are futile.

It is not necessary to create a world state or obtain the consent of sixty governments. There are only seven great powers that disturb the peace of the world; an agreement between them to adopt the same sort of law that prevails within each country would be sufficient.

World peace can be brought nearer fulfillment if Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, Japan, and the United States will agree to recognize the sanctity of boundaries and discipline any nation that sends troops across the border. The method of enforcing such an agreement is less important than the willingness to adopt this principle. The threat of immediate ostracism would probably be a sufficient deterrent.

We are told that this proposal is over-simplified; that the Fascist powers would never adopt it; that England, France, and the United States have never been ready for it; that no great nation would dare propose it for fear of arousing internal disorders; that such drastic proposals are easy to make at a desk but impossible to carry out politically; that the enforcement of it would promote war; that it is contrary to human nature; that people cannot be made to behave as they ought to; that the cause of peace is weakened by proposals which have no chance of success; that law grows slowly and cannot be imposed upon independent sovereign units; that coercion produces resistance, not conformity; that the attempt to coerce results in war and anarchy; that impatient reformers in making impossible demands make the task more difficult than it already is, and produce the very opposite of what they expect.

It is true that this proposal is extremely simple, like other practical pacifist ideas that have been rejected in favor of complicated diplomacy. It is true that the great powers have never been ready to relinquish their special privileges, preferring to depend upon military and naval strength rather than upon justice. It is also true that the conventional method has failed. The best that is hoped for is no war for two years.

If the drastic proposal that the powers agree to conform to an international law equally binding upon all will produce results beneficial to each and every nation, it is not expecting too much of human nature to suggest its adoption. The assurance of permanent peace and the freedom from the burden of competitive armaments would more than counterbalance any gains that might accrue from the conquest of additional territory.

At all times the answer to pacifist proposals has been that, while the United States was peace-loving, other nations were not. This is a specious objection, for the United States has never been ready to abandon its policy of isolation in favor of international coöperation. It refused to join the League of Nations; and, when flirting with the World Court, proposed joining only if no adverse decisions would be rendered against us. It has refused to abolish capital battleships, or discuss total disarmament, or relinquish extraterritoriality and supervision over weaker neighbors, or to codify international law. Neutrality, with a navy large enough to protect our citizens in all parts of the world, is apt to lead us into war. Collective security in the form of a military alliance will almost certainly involve us in the next conflict. Or, even if the United States is kept out of war, the war system will remain legal throughout the world.

International law cannot be imposed upon sovereign nations, but if it is voluntarily adopted, it will be to the advantage of each signatory that the law be enforced. The League's method of military sanctions has failed. An international police force would be difficult, but an agreement to suspend trade with an aggressor is far less an act of war than is the use of force. If such an agreement had been made by the seven military powers in 1918, or even in 1928, when Japan, Italy and Germany would have consented, the invasions of Manchukuo, Ethiopia, and China would have been avoided, and possibly the civil war in Spain.

It is futile to condemn solely the present aggressors when we have been unwilling to relinquish our own imperialism. It is possible that the Fascists would even now listen if a proposal for recognition of existing boundaries were made. Territory conquered would not

be returned, but a new policy might be accepted from now on. Marshal Goering has recently declared that Germany has always been ready to limit armaments as much as others would.

Discouraging as the international outlook is, there is no better time for reforming our country than right now. Our militaristic President needs education; our Congress should propose to the other six dangers of the world the relinquishment by America of its special privileges if they will also agree. Until we are prepared to make these concessions it cannot be said that the Fascists are solely to blame for the terror that stalks the earth today.

Now is the time for all good men and women to declare their opposition to security obtained by force. Let them urge the government of the United States to take the initiative in substituting law for war among the nations.

This False Dilemma

GEORGE M. GIBSON

And now comes the organized challenge of our general peace determination. That we are a people strongly desiring peace is shown by the recent polls of the Institute of Public Opinion. On several different peace propositions, the returns indicate from 65 to 95 per cent against the martial spirit. At what seems to be the crest of the wave of peace sentiment there is launched an "educational" campaign to change the thinking of the nation on the vital issues of international policy. The usual propaganda methods are resorted to, with slogans as empty as world war shibboleths, and hardly different. With slightly changed phrasing, we are urged again to "make the world safe for democracy," and to prepare for "the war to end war." I concern myself here with the one phase of this campaign which seems more effective than any other single argument at the moment.

It is the false dilemma between "isolationism" and "collective security of democratic nations." No one need be surprised that the arms bloc would resort to a trick as ancient as Greek sophistry in their effort to impose their minority will upon the nation. But one may be excused a bit of pained surprise if leading liberals and liberal journals are even now being taken in by an ingenious bit of false dichotomy.

Is the vigorous peace movement in America to be impaled on one or the other of these horns? Let us hope not! It is my earnest hope that there is still time to apply criticism to this twisted logic, and that the liberal elements will meet the situation with a positive logic of their own. Certainly they cannot feel comfortable as proponents of "collective security" in company with the most reactionary elements of our national life! Nor will they relish the thought that the staunchest peace defenders of our past era, the most socially-minded of our citizenship, are defined as "isolationists."

There would be rich humor, were it not tragic, in the spectacle of our most hidebound sticklers for the status quo in domestic relations, now throwing hats in the air with praise for "the strong line" policy for the world society. Many of these new collectivists have never collected anything but their dividends, and can demonstrate no higher motive in their zeal for re-armament than to protect investments abroad. They have resisted every effort of the New Deal liberalism toward the gradual reorganization of our industrial society to bring about that basic justice without which no peace is possible. Meanwhile voices were raised on behalf of the essential "togetherness" of humanity, and organizations were launched to achieve that prophetic hope. To such voices our elements of reaction turned deaf ears; and such organizations met their concerted opposition. From reaction's side came such cries as: "Let Europe stew"; "no cancellation of war debts"; "no entangling alliances"; "Buy America"; "America first." And now, *mirable dictu!* our defenders of privilege have turned "collectivist," and scorn those who reject their muddled definitions as "isolationists!"

This dilemma cries out for examination. It may then be seen for what it is, a highly partisan and a specious argument. Those promoting its circulation are not in search of objective truth; but resort to the tricks of special pleading. They attempt to maneuver their opposition into the untenable position of "isolationism." They arrogate to themselves such favor as attaches to three great ideas, collectivism, security, and democracy, misusing all three terms. And they falsely exclude any possibility of a third position, which is more likely to be the stand of true peace.

There is one major isolationist, and his name is *Mars*. War is the original separatist movement. The whole philosophy upon which war is based, and that includes all preparedness programs, is divisive. The efforts of preparedness advocates to separate themselves from their responsibilities as warmakers are futile. The notion that war is prevented by preparation is as wrong today as it ever was. Preparedness people are war people; the relationship follows as ends follow means, and as effect follows cause. Honest minds may be led to believe that by the bluff of large war preparation, war may be averted; but their honesty will not alter the facts. Preparedness and the technique of bluff may be expected to miss war only by an accident not now in prospect. And war inevitably isolates nations from their enemies, and makes for such spurious solidarity between allies as is readily dissipated when, after the conflict, the scramble for spoils begins.

To assume that pacifists, in breaking absolutely with war, are therefore breaking with humanity is a ridiculous reversal of the facts. Motivated by the vision of a unified world society, they have broken with war as the great disrupter of all unity. On the other hand they have furthered every coöperative attempt in politics, economics, education, religion. Whatever that philosophy may be accused of, it may not reasonably be accused of "isolationism." Yet "isolationism" is presented as the sole alternative to the program now being so vigorously pushed.

That program, as we have seen, presents three terms, each desperately needing clarification. Just what do the backers of administration foreign policy mean by the phrase, "collective security of democratic

states?" That chant, through constant repetition, may lull the critical powers to slumber; it may become a slogan which, though intrinsically meaningless, may wield a power to make millions march.

It is not "collective" in a world sense. Rejecting, as it does, those nations branded "bad," and casting lots with the virtuous, it closes doors effectively on possible consultations on origins of grievance. It assumes the status quo in international relations to be right, and all effort to change it an offense punishable by death. It forgets that this status quo, established at Versailles, is of the essence of injustice, with no health nor permanence in it. Fighting to save this status quo is made no more righteous by calling it collectivism. There have been several kinds of world-collectivism, and most of them merit respect of those who would like to see peace a reality. But this new version is seen, upon close examination, to be merely a new name for an old article. It is not a collective, but an alliance that is sought. Let it be so called, and let it stand or fall on its merits.

The term "security" is quite as deceptive. Those who look upon great armaments as a stabilizing force in world affairs have simply not read their history books. They have not even read their daily papers. Peace is not to be found in meeting threat with counter-threat. War comes that way, and war spells insecurity, absolute and irreparable. What is it we are asked to make secure by war? Certainly not our democratic institutions, for the May bill is offered by which all internal democracy will be disposed of forthwith. Nor can one visualize any other sort of security that could derive from a modern campaign, though we should win all the decisions on field or sea. What realist would try to gainsay that the victories of modern war are pyrrhic, without fail; and must be paid for in cancelled debts, mass unemployment, and general bankruptcy? Yet we are asked to arm and to seek armed alliance with other nations for the sake of "security!"

And the third term is "democracy." To hold that the Fascist states endanger peace is a truth, but a half-truth. The question must be raised: What made them Fascist? And the so-called democratic states are seen to be involved in the complex of causes. All share in the guilt of the coming struggle. To style certain nations mad proves nothing, nor should it make it any more attractive for us to follow the same mad course. Since Dorothea Dix's crusading among the insane asylums of one hundred years ago, we have changed our ways with madmen. At least, we inquire into the causes of their malady.

But, with no apology for the war-guilt of Fascist states, let us ask: *What* are these "democracies" we seek to save? They are Russia, France, England, and the United States. The first is avowedly not a democracy. One may welcome such economic hopes as issue out of that tragic land, but why, for the sake of our preparedness program, should we now turn to calling it a democracy? That politics makes strange bedfellows is seen again in the united support given the administration's "strong line" policy by Landon and Stimson on the one hand, and by Browder and Litvinoff on the other. This is surely not confronting Fascism with a truly democratic world philosophy, but with American nationalism and Russian nationalism finding common cause.

Neither England nor France is a democracy, even in the political sense. Both are empires claiming far more peoples in their colonies than in their homelands.

And in England, France, and America, the forces that today are making common cause to save "democracy" in the world are exactly the forces which, through prosperity and depression, have sought to defeat democracy in domestic industrial relations.

All this we are supposed to choose, or be branded isolationists! We had supposed that the slogans "in time of peace prepare for war," "war to end war," and "safe for democracy" had all been tried out almost exactly twenty years ago and had proved costly delusions. Their presentation at this time is as lacking in originality as they are dangerous in implications.

The false dilemma must be rejected. That peace movement alone will endure which makes its stand upon peace, steadfastly refusing all rationalizations which lead toward war.

The Coming Peace

JOSEPH BARTH

The next world war is at hand. The minor, so-called "civil" war in Spain is a symptom only—a ghastly symptom to be sure. The comparatively unimportant war of "protective occupation" which Japan carries on against China is another symptom. The chest-pounding of nationalists is a symptom. Nationalism itself, with its accompanying theories of racial superiority, its trade barriers, its isolationism and its talk of self-sustentation, is a symptom. The armament race is a symptom. All these symptoms point to the disease of nationalist fear or nationalistic megalomania. The reasonable outcome will be the insanity of war; given present social psychoses, another war is inevitable.

But war is not inevitable, though the next world war is. There is an alternative to the lunatic suicide which war may some day (but has not yet) become. That alternative is a world organization: international coöperation on a basis of an evolving international law.

This does not mean that we should suddenly about-face as a nation, get ourselves immediately into as many entangling alliances as possible, and join the League of Nations *now*. No, not now! Having committed the grave sin of isolating our influence from the world by refusing to join the League at its inception; having contributed to the making of German megalomania by a repressive peace of Versailles; having under the plea of economic preservation started the strangling high-tariff craze; having sinned against brother nations so mightily and so long, we are in a position where, if we want to save our physical lives, we must continue the sin of selfish, short-sighted isolation. We must, and we will (whether it were right or no) keep out of the way of the results of our past sins, re-arming meantime with might and main to commit the crime of war which the interdependence of sinning nations makes inevitable. Out of that war will limp the warped bodies and the blackened, with-

ered souls of the nations. And Peace, Peace will come again.

O Educators, Statesmen, Laborers, Professional Men, Men of God! What of the coming peace? That is the present task. Leave war to the militarists. They will see to it that we are prepared. They will invent lies to make us feel righteous as we tithe the false god Mars. They will make for us the tools of our future crime, and when they feel that the time is ripe to strike we will feel so too. The militarists will tend to all that. But the peace—after the hell we must go through—the coming peace, who will tend to that? It is a most important business. It cannot wait until a fresh America rips an "armistice" and victory out of the tired bowels of writhing Europe. We waited for "victory" before we planned the peace last time—and that peace was a grievous cause of the war we soon will fight. Shall the coming peace be another such? It need not be, if men will *now* plan it otherwise, if men will *now* begin to shoulder the responsibilities which peace entails. Those responsibilities flow naturally out of individual and group participation in world order which is the only alternative to world war.

After the forthcoming catastrophe, we as individuals must see to it that our nation has the will to join the League of Nations. If at that time the League is non-existent, we must be prepared on the basis of precedent and experience to establish a league of nations, a commonwealth of nations, an international union of powers. Call it what you will, its name is unimportant, except as the name connotes its function. Its functions are all-important.

The first of these is to adopt a few fundamental principles of law as the basis for future international action. These principles are to some degree at least already inherent in the present League and in other instruments of peace, such as pacts, trade-treaties, and such like. To experts working in the field of international law should be left the actual work of codifying these principles. Ours should be the will which demands their labors.

Given this framework of principles, the popular will should also be behind the establishment of some method by which the law might have a growing edge. There should be some permanent lawmaking body in the international set-up. Whether this legislative body is to act independently of the appeals of member nations, or whether, as the *New Commonwealth Society* urges, it shall begin by acting only as an Equity Tribunal at the behest of disputing nations—this is a question somewhat dependent upon the life or death of the present League. But law, international or otherwise, must have a growing edge, without which lawlessness becomes the only rule for change. Regardless of what nations are, or are not, members of the present League, without some such provision for lawful change it could not work for long. Disputes must be settled on the basis of evolving principles, with justice, rather than on the basis of the maintenance of the status quo as the ideal. When these provisos have been actualized, a world court would have a possible ground upon which to stand and make decisions. Without it, the essential instrument of a world court becomes a mere parody on justice.

But for successful world order we must be willing to urge our government to take one further step. The decisions of an Equity Tribunal or of some kind of world judiciary must be upheld against all comers. Therefore it is most important that the commonwealth of nations in the world order have at its command various instruments of force, upon which in the last analysis all law depends for efficacy. Decisions of the Equity Tribunal or world court should be capable of enforcement: first, by the use of social pressures (moral force); secondly, by the use of economic sanctions (economic force); and, thirdly, by means of an international police force (physical force). As a symbol of a nation's good faith in the attempt at international coöperation, and to insure the efficacy of force in some degree either moral, economic, or physical, in upholding justice, all the participating nations should completely disband their nationalist military machines, internationalizing all civil aircraft as part of the bargain. So long as one military machine exists within or outside of a league of nations, just so long is there a definite possibility of war, or something which looks just like it. Owning a navy (or an army or military air force for that matter) is much like drinking cocktails: drink one cocktail—it is not enough, drink two cocktails—just right, but there is always some good fellow about who invites, yes insists, that you have three cocktails—and three cocktails are not nearly enough. No, while humanity is a youngster, it is much safer to turn all the dynamite over to some authoritative papa. Papa may, it is true, while clearing a pasture of stumps of old trees, blow up one of his own cows. And the youngsters may get in among the dynamite caps and take them off to some open fire and throw them in one by one. A great many dangers lie in this whole procedure—admittedly. But life is risk. The question is not, "shall we take a risk?" but rather, "for what shall the risk be taken?"

Most of us, if we knew what we were doing, would rather take ten chances on a good thing than one chance on a bad one. And those people who are studying and working for the principles above outlined—principles, some of which are explicit and all of which are implicit in the *New Commonwealth Plan* for peace—believe that international order is worth taking many chances to obtain. They believe it is worth working for.

There are, of course, some seeming pessimists among those who believe in the essential principles of the *New Commonwealth Plan* for peace. These say that there is insufficient time to prepare the mind of the world to act intelligently for its own good after the coming world war. They declare that the United States will not then join the League of Nations or a league; that nations will not so quickly give up their armies and navies; that they will be too bloated with "victory" or too bowed down in defeat to think sanely for the international good. Yet even these pessimists are optimists. For when you drive them to it, they will admit that some day there will be peace. If it does not come as a result of the effort men put into the next peace, or if that peace fails because the initiative and responsibility and intelligence of men have failed, it will come after the peace which follows the war they did not prevent. Eventually peace will come, and when it comes, it will come because certain moral and social and economic and physical requirements have been met. Despite whatever wars that lie ahead, peace is coming. The question is: how much hell do we have to go through before we achieve it? It is a question which to some degree depends upon each individual for an answer.

Study Table

America and the Next War

AND SO TO WAR. *By Hubert Herring. New Haven: Yale University Press.* $2.00.

Here is a tremendous and terrifying book. It should be shouted from the housetops. It should be sold on the street corners and in the market places. It should be required reading in the colleges, and for one Sunday, at least, might well displace the Bible in our church pulpits. I should have a heightened respect for this country, and a sudden reassurance in these dreadful times, if this book could have a sale to match that of Dale Carnegie's *How to Make Friends and Influence People.*

Mr. Herring is one of our most effective journalists and authors today. He has long been a keen student of international affairs, and his close and intimate study of the State Department in Washington has borne notable fruit in his recent article in *Harper's Magazine.* Just now he has become excited over the sudden trend of this country towards war, under the direction of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, and he sets down his reason for believing that we should all be excited—and alarmed. "It would be a relief," writes Halford E. Luccock, in a review of this book in *Zion's Herald,* "if we could dismiss the revelations . . . as overheated oratory or hysteria. But Mr. Herring deals with fact, not emotion; with history, not histrionics."

What Mr. Herring does is to tell us flatly and frankly what the administration has been doing in recent months. He shows how, step by step, we have been and still are doing the very things which took us into the World War in 1917. The record of that dreadful betrayal of twenty years ago is briefly and caustically recited, and then follows a statement, matched point by point in fearful parallel, of "the march of 1938." It is a march straight toward inevitable war, conducted in open violation of the neutrality laws of the government and in similar defiance of the will of the people, and in inexcusable neglect of the lessons taught us in our last experience of arms. We are treading the old road swiftly to destruction, public opinion is being poisoned by propaganda, and the President is preparing himself in debonair unconcern for the same folly and fate which made Woodrow Wilson one of the most tragic figures in history.

It is impossible to exaggerate the brilliancy of Mr. Herring's treatment of his theme, and its convincing power. His thumbnail sketches of the men who took us into the last war—Woodrow Wilson, Walter Hines Page, Edward M. House, Robert Lansing, Nicholas Murray Butler—are only less devastating in piercing wit and corroding sarcasm than his sketches of the men who are now taking us into the next war—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, Henry L. Stimson—"and there is always the New York *Times!*" Impressive are his "in memoriam" tributes to the men who tried heroically but vainly to keep us out of the last war—William Jennings Bryan, Robert M. La Follette, Robert N. Page, Charles A. Lindbergh, Claude Kitchin, George W. Norris, William J. Stone—"and there were others!" Will there be such men again in the approaching war crisis? Mr. Herring thinks so—"an honor list from 1938 [which] will carry the names of those who resist the warmakers while there is yet time, the names of those who are not fooled or cajoled."

Nothing in this superlatively effective volume is better than the author's exposure of the delusions that are now betraying the public mind—the slogans and propaganda myths deliberately being spread before the people by the administration like nets before unwary birds. The idea that the British are "our friends" or have any desire but to win our much-needed help to preserve the Empire for anything but democratic purposes, the idea of "collective security" as a plea for one more good war to save civilization, the silly Sir Galahad notion of a world divided between good nations and bad nations, the pure superstition that the next war in Europe or in Asia will be anything more than one more vicious struggle between empires for imperial mastery and exploitation of the world—all these are riddled by a veritable machine-gun fire of argument and irony. Mr. Herring leaves not a rag of intellectual or spiritual respectability upon the present advocates of preparedness for armed participation in the settlement of world affairs by the old familiar process of fighting it out. He ridicules and denounces the liberals and radicals among us today who, unlike the liberals and radicals of twenty years ago, uphold the hands of the warmakers by deliberately confusing "isolation," as they love to call it, with neutrality and peace. Mr. Herring treats this bugaboo as it deserves to be treated:

> The proponents of neutrality know full well that there can be no isolation in an interdependent world. If they are isolationists, theirs is an isolation against the world's wars, not a refusal to share in adjusting the world's economic inequalities.
>
> But to abjure isolation, must we swing altogether the other way, and admit the necessity of national suicide because others take that course? Is it blind isolationism which leads us to affirm that we are not duty and wisdom bound to enter the lists where nations engage in a death struggle for imperial power? Are we craven because we see no grounds for using our men and guns to protect one set of empires as against another set?
>
> The genuine neutral is the enemy of isolation. He knows that war, far from breaking down isolation and flaunting nationalism, rears new nationalisms intent upon self-sufficiency, which is the heart of isolation.

What it all leads to is evident. Says Mr. Herring:

> We are headed toward inevitable involvement in the wars of Europe and Asia.
>
> The President of the United States, with excellent conscience and pure intention, is doing those things which are calculated to yield him a place in history with Woodrow Wilson—as one of the two most dangerous men ever to occupy the White House.
>
> The Secretary of State by his inflexibility and consuming belief in the virtues of coercion is making his bid for the harsh judgment of the future.
>
> Theirs is the way to war.
>
> The one hope is that an energized citizenry, awakened to the peril, may demand of Congress a swift staying of the present trend.
>
> Congress alone can recall us to the sane path of neutrality, putting a stop to all talk of joint blockades of Japan, recalling our nationals from all war zones, stipulating that all travel and trade in war zones are the risk of the traveler and trader, and stopping all trade with the belligerents in the implements of war.
>
> Congress can do these things if the people speak.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

No Peace with Napoleon

NAPOLEON: PORTRAIT OF A KING. *By R. McNair Wilson. New York: Longmans, Green & Company.* $3.50.

As Dr. Wilson's interpretation is primarily financial, much of the usual Napoleonic pageantry might well be lacking; not so, however, for Dr. Wilson unites economic analysis to spectacular presentation in such a manner as to show his subject, perhaps more vividly than ever before, as the outstanding popular protagonist (Roosevelt's predecessor!) of money for use and service, as over against a financial Europe, commanded by England, seconded by Russia, committed to money solely for profit. Based on Caulaincourt's recently published memoirs, the first, according to our biographer, revealing Napoleon's secret from his own mouth, this production is at once novel, colorful, provocative. Whether or not its basic contention (i. e., that all preceding Napoleonic literature is incomplete due to absence of those writings) holds water, our readers should absorb the book thoroughly and then decide for themselves; to us, the whole matter, although its probability is very great, remains a suspended judgment.

What stands clear beyond recall is that this constitutes R. McNair Wilson's *opus,* an audacious product of great scholarship and intensive research, written swiftly, vigorously, tersely, and with marked poetic beauty. Unheeded by reviewers (whose giant ignorance, one might suppose, would have seized upon it eagerly as something to slate), disregarded by both radio and pulpit, *Napoleon: Portrait of a King,* aside from one's estimate of its thesis, remains a new, convincing, forthright realization of that shadow which hangs all too heavily upon us, and which, incarnate, if we ourselves fail to solve our economic riddle, will most certainly proceed to do so for us.

ROBERT SCHALLER.

Dr. Morgan's Book

THE LONG ROAD. *By Arthur E. Morgan. Three lectures delivered on the Alden-Tuthill Foundation at the Chicago Theological Seminary.* 144 *pp. Washington, D. C.: National Home Library Foundation. Twenty-five cents.*

The Long Road is particularly enlightening and practical because it is written by a man with an engineer's mind, a man who all his life has deliberately developed first and foremost personal integrity and character. It is "rich with life-wisdom," as Dorothy Canfield Fisher states in her illuminating Foreword. Dr. Morgan analyzes in his concise and economical style the faults, and causes for the faults, of the foundations upon which business, government, institutions, and personal conduct are being built.

Those of us who were privileged to have been students at Antioch College while he was President retain the stimulation and the inspiration of his example, for beyond all other individuals in our minds he stands as a rock impregnable to moral or ethical compromise. We have often thought what patient suffering he must have endured while watching so many of us undergraduates floundering through the first stages of approaching maturity in an effort to grasp any experience which might give us a "sense of validity," the exhibitions of adolescent individualism, and the too-rare manifestations of a maturing social-consciousness, without which there is no hope for the future.

First among the teachings he emphasized, both by words and the example of his living, is this, which is repeated in *The Long Road:*

> As the first element of a universal framework of character is the full and vital acceptance of the fact that each individual is an integral part of all human life, present and future, and that his actions should be determined by their possible total effect and not solely by their effect on him alone, or on his immediate circle, or on his immediate present.

The long road is the road of character development, first personal and individual, leading to the inevitable consequence of social integrity. Chapter 1 deals with "Limitations of Government and Industry," in which Dr. Morgan diagnoses the present diseases of society as "real malnutrition—a scurvy of the social order, a political pellagra, a beriberi of business. In the case of foods, even after the discovery of vitamins, the correction of dietary deficiencies of the population is a long and gradual process of education and social organization."

In emphasizing the need for social planning, he states that it is a curious fact that many of those people who decry any kind of national planning as evil, and who hold that we should be subject to natural law, are the same people who look upon as sacred the one inclusive national plan we now have—our national constitution.

With an engineer's analogy he likens the tensile strength of steel needed for the most efficient and economical construction of a suspension bridge to the tensile strength of the personal character by which is built the social organization. If the latter is of a low level, there comes a time when no refinement of social planning, no expenditure of public wealth, however great, will create a good social order. "It is time, I say, that we turn our principal attention from increasing intricacies of social and economic design to the quality of the social materials with which we build."

He discusses the real frontiers of American life, in this nation where we are inclined to think that all frontiers have been conquered, as being in the field of defining and stimulating the best possible drives and motives and disciplines of character and community attitudes, a definite challenge even greater than that of meeting and overcoming physical barriers to progress.

Chapter 2, "Specifications for National Character," begins by a face-to-face approach—What Is Character? The results of Dr. Morgan's experiences in both youth and adulthood, his shrewd and careful observations, and the results of his logical conclusions consist of these three qualifications:

> 1. *Purposefulness:* the vision of the life it would be well to lead, of the kind of a world which, in so far as wisdom, judgment, and good will can determine, it would be well to live in.
>
> 2. *Good will* and the skilled and disciplined drive of desire which presses toward the realization of aims and purposes.
>
> 3. *Ethical and moral qualities,* the habitual choice of means that are wholesome in their own effects. That is an ethical act which is good in the light of its total consequences.

Dr. Morgan does not discuss religion, as such; he *acts* it. Note this: "This condition of being a social and not a solitary animal is the fact which, more than almost any other, should determine one's wisdom of what constitutes a good life. Intellectually we need not argue the fact, *but failure to recognize it in actual conduct is one of the chief hindrances to social development.*" (Italics mine.)

As we read that, we saw him walking briskly

across the campus toward his office as though hounded by the pressing realization that man's life is too short for accomplishing all that he should get done. His expression was one of serious intensity; his nod quick, and his smile brilliant, though fleeting. We used to think of Drinkwater's line about Abraham Lincoln, "Lonely is the man who understands."

Continuing, he discusses the diversity of types of social organization in America, cites examples of communistic fire departments and public schools, socialistic irrigation systems and municipal water plants, autocratic and aristocratic government of some large institutions of learning, despotisms of a few industrial plants, and many other types. There are, of course, many which are the result not of purposeful search and determined mastery, but a haphazard mixture of native impulses, early training, religious influence, the prevailing social habits, and a few individuals' occasional contributions, but all hanging together within the loose framework of American social organization. And he believes that at present there is value in diversity.

From here he approaches the elements of an ethical code, and in this particular passage there is an amazing degree of prophecy.

> Tolerance and humility of spirit must accompany great courage and commitment to purpose, the habit of honest and open dealing. The effort of men to withhold the truth from each other and to deceive each other mars many relationships, confuses issues, and leads men to use a large part of their energies in trying to circumvent each other.
>
> There must be the habit of self-denial, foresight and accumulation of reserves for the times of stress. Periods of stress will come. They can best be surmounted by those who have kept themselves vigorous and tempered to privation, who have achieved poise and have learned to use their energies temperately, who have habitually lived within their means, and who have reserves for emergency. Such character is not quickly improvised. It is the result of a philosophy of living and a long continuous discipline.*

*For anyone interested in a more detailed discussion of Dr. Morgan's philosophy of life, we recommend his book *My World*, published by Kahoe and Spieth, Yellow Springs, Ohio. If you wish to know the trials of his pioneer boyhood in Minnesota and the ethical problems he had to meet and solve in his youth, read *Finding His World*, by Lucy Griscom Morgan, his wife, also published in Yellow Springs.

One of the most profound passages in the book is that dealing with the nature of democracy. "Real democracy is not equal sharing of power and opportunity, it is equal commitment to a common good. . . . There is only one basis on which the universal play of abilities among men can work to the fullest extent. That is by the self-discipline of enlightened, socially-minded character. Repeatedly it may be necessary to act in a way which is detrimental to the person involved but which in the end will be good for society as a whole."

Dr. Morgan's words are not empty phrases; he is not a man to waste either words or energy. For the following statement this reviewer reveres him, "Those who are engaged in the effort to make honesty the best policy do not need our pity any more than does the explorer who risks all he has to discover a new region, for they are doing what they prefer above all else. They have a zest for living which gives life interest, and a sense of well-being which remains only with those who feel that their efforts may have enduring value."

The third chapter deserves the closest attention of all, but space does not permit this. It deals with what the individual can do about it. It is for every person to read who is an integral part of the existing social (dis)order, and who is not?

Chapter 4 cites numerous cases of individuals among Dr. Morgan's acquaintance who are working on the principles of conduct which he advocates. Also there is a delightfully humorous tale of a conversation between the eternally patient Creator and the extremely impatient devil concerning the slowness of the human race to awaken to the consciousness of its creative powers. "The long way round of building character in the end will prove to have been the short way home to a good social order."

This book, though it costs but twenty-five cents, is mighty in content and deserves to be in the hands and in the heart of every lawmaker, leader, teacher, minister, parent; in short, all who are concerned with living the good and abundant life. It is futile to prate of freedom so long as Self is undisciplined. And what composes a citizenship save innumerable Selves?

V. Freiderika Van Buskirk.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

Second section: A hundred brawny bullies with bayonets prodding a conscript in uniform who is bearing a placard: "I am a volunteer in the chain gang."

Third section: Five hundred policemen pummeling a pacifist soap box orator while roaring: "He don't believe in the humanitarian aims of this war! Sock him again!"

Fourth secton: One thousand policemen slugging a scrawny radical while screaming: "He believes in force and violence, the damn red! Slug him again!"

Fifth section: A war-time dictator lashing a group of factory workers, farmers, business men and Congressmen while howling: "This is a war to preserve democracy!"

Sixth section: An official from the war intelligence office bearing a sign proclaiming solemnly: "All quiet on the western front." He is followed by a hundred trucks containing corpses, all quiet.

Seventh section: A float on which stands a dollar-a-year munitions magnate and adviser to the Government. He has one foot in a barrel marked "dividends" and the other foot on a flyspeck marked "patriotism."

Eighth section: A starving man in rags and tatters, lean, diseased, bandaged, and crippled, holding up a tremendous placard: "The war has ended. We are victorious!" He is accompanied by two fat profiteers who hold him up.

Ninth section to Section 789: Ghosts. Ten million ghosts. Ghosts of soldiers and civilians. Ghosts of young men and old men and women and children. They march past the reviewing stand file after file, day after day, month after month, from this Army Day to the next, until the spectators go lunatic from watching their spectral salutes.

Section 790: A truck bearing a placard: "What the war solved." The truck is empty.

That is the end of the model parade.

By this time, of course, the spectators have gone home, or have fainted, or have died of heart attacks, but the man in the reviewing stand is made of sterner stuff, and sits motionless with a fixed smile on his fleshless face, day after day and month after month, for death takes no holiday.

New York *Post*.

Ten Commandments of Brotherhood

Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk of the Federal Council of Churches

1. I will respect all men and women regardless of their race or religion.
2. I will protect and defend my neighbor and my neighbor's children against the ravages of racial or religious bigotry.
3. I will exemplify in my own life the spirit of good will and understanding.
4. I will challenge the philosophy of racial superiority by whomsoever it

(*Continued on page* 80)

Correspondence

Dr. Morgan and the T. V. A.

I

Editor of UNITY:

I was quite astounded by the editorial in UNITY of April 4th entitled "Morgan, Roosevelt and the T. V. A." Whoever wrote the editorial is due for a painful disillusionment, if I know anything of the issues involved and Dr. Arthur Morgan's relations thereto.

I am sending you a copy of Senate Document No. 55 containing complete transcript of the White House hearings and commend it to your serious study. . . .

One may disagree with President Roosevelt's policies in many fields. There can be no dispute, however, over the fact that he has pursued an intelligent and courageous policy in respect to utilities and the conservation of water power throughout. I suggest that you urge Mr. Burlingham to read the testimony of the White House hearings as a lawyer and get his comment.

JUDSON KING, *Director,*
National Popular Government League.
Washington, D. C.

II

Editor of UNITY:

. . . . You say in regard to the T. V. A. mixup, "Where the trouble and the truth be in this situation, we do not know," and then go on to declare that "in any quarrel between him [Arthur Morgan] and his two colleagues, we line up on his side every time." This seems to be putting a personal regard before a regard for the truth. I do not agree that, in the statement you quote, there is all there is to be said. My answer to this plea is that it is just a plea and not a consideration of the evidence, which we are yet to hear. It is putting the judgment before the evidence. Like you I have an admiration for Dr. Morgan by reputation, but you know that even the brightest minds get strange quirks sometimes. I do not believe in the papers judging a case before it is tried. Both Republicans and Democrats in Ohio have the highest regard for Senator Donahey, and feel that he will ferret out the truth of the trouble.

MAY STRANATHAN.
Cumberland, Ohio.

[Editorial Note: There has been no pre-judgment in the Morgan case. We do not know the truth, because Dr. Arthur Morgan has not submitted his evidence for the defense. He was abundantly justified, in our opinion, in his refusal to submit this evidence in response to the President's peremptory demand, as the President was a biased judge, and Congress and the people were entitled to pass upon the facts. As the matter now lies, we must believe Dr. Morgan innocent until he is proved guilty—all the more in the light of his great career and unimpeachable reputation as an engineer, an educator, a political progressive, and a high-minded gentleman! After all, there was a certain man in an earlier day who stood before a judge, and remained silent.—J. H. H.]

III

Editor of UNITY:

I liked the April 4th issue of UNITY very much. Your summing up of the Morgan Case is superb. I only regret that you did not state that Arthur E. Morgan was the only engineer on the Commission. . . .

I have sometimes doubted whether the Government could successfully operate the marvelous power to be developed at Muscle Shoals, and this latest episode leaves me still more in doubt. . . .

LYMAN WARD, *Principal,*
Southern Industrial Institute.
Camp Hill, Alabama.

A Freedom of the Press Case

Editor of UNITY:

As a journalist you undoubtedly value the freedom of the press. For without freedom of expression, freedom of thought becomes meaningless. Government officials often assume the role of censors, although giving lip-service toward this basic concept upon which our country has been founded. Only recently President Roosevelt appealed to all democratic governments to offer political asylum to all who are forced to flee those countries where bandits now hold full sway. It is in face of such a magnanimous stand by President Roosevelt that one has the right to question how closely his own administration lives up to this commendable position. A striking case in question is the one of Marcus Graham who refused to aid the United States authorities in having himself exiled after nineteen years of persecution—for the sole crime of attempting to exercise the basic rights of free speech.

This case of flagrant injustice will, we trust, arouse you to give it the widest possible exposure. Through you we appeal to all liberty-loving people to come forward in aiding us morally and materially. Protests should be directed to President Roosevelt against his permitting the nineteen-year-old persecution of Marcus Graham to continue. Likewise, the Secretary of Labor, Miss Frances Perkins, should be called upon immediately to dismiss the nineteen-year-old warrant of deportation against Graham, as well as to order a stoppage of the indirect persecution of *Man!*, of which Graham is editor. U. S. Judge Leon R. Yankwich, of Los Angeles, California, should be asked to purge Graham of the contempt sentence, since the said Judge has himself asserted that he would not aid in enforcing a "stale warrant" of nineteen years standing. We suggest also the arranging of protest meetings by liberal and labor groups.

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE.
Los Angeles, California.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 79)

may be proclaimed, whether by kings, dictators, or demagogues.

5. I will not be misled by the lying propaganda of those who seek to set race against race or nation against nation.

6. I will refuse to support any organization that has for its purpose the spreading of anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, or anti-Protestantism.

7. I will establish comradeship with all those who seek to exalt the spirit of love and reconciliation throughout the world.

8. I will attribute to those who differ from me the same degree of sincerity that I claim for myself.

9. I will uphold the civil rights and religious liberties of all citizens and groups whether I agree with them or not.

10. I will do more than live and let live; I will live and help live.

Industry Wants Peace*

"American industry wants peace. It is opposed to war. People sometimes say that industry prospers through wars. This is not true. In addition to the moral issues involved, American manufacturers realize that the losses in human lives and injuries are irreparable. Wars result in overwhelming loads of debt and in subsequent depressions which more than wipe out any apparent profits. The manufacturers of the United States want international peace."

*One of the chief planks in the platform issued December 8 by the Manufacturers Association for the year 1938.

May 16th issue of UNITY will be a CLARENCE DARROW MEMORIAL

Orders should be placed in advance for extra copies.